

7/5/71

Dear Ed,

Your 6/30 mailing, reached me today, making remarkably fast time from St. Louis, where it was postmarked at 2 p.m. yesterday. Glad to get the dupe Alford clip and the ~~XXXX~~ "Truth". Will read when I can. "out busy, and Jerry is overdue.

Your sending of the Alford resignation clip, of which I did not otherwise have known, told me something was up, but I never dreamed what. Briefly, this may be bigger than it seems. They've made it close to impossible to convict, perhaps even try Jim, and that is not accidental. They'll have to hide Gervais for the rest of his life, and he'll insist on living well. As he has. He is the man of all I've met least inhibited in talking of his own crookedness, as the law sees crookedness, has bragged about his skill in framing and the speed with which he can produce unframing affidavits (24 hours). He is the one in whom Jim had most trust. This was a setup, if not a frame, which I consider probable, an entrapment.

Because I do not get the H.O. papers, I'd appreciate being kept up to date.

Much later: Jerry has arrived, I've read the "Truth" and continue to wonder the man has escaped confinement. But perhaps this is his wildest.

An added thought, if it is not burdensome: Often the NYTimes does not reach here in the a.m. Two of the past three days it did not. I think that in terms of the law and government motive rather than JG's guilt or innocence, the press treatment may become an issue. If it is not asking too much, I'd appreciate it if you could save and send the NYC stories you see also, so I could assume that when you have not sent a clip you saw no story, it might, in the end, have value. I do not mean to send daily, only when there is enough for a stamp, or about an ounce. This would be frequent enough and a little less trouble. It has, for example, just occurred to me that with plenty of time on the first day's play, neither the Wash Post nor the NYTimes carried JG's denial, although early evening TV did. I think that as a matter of law, in court, this can be cited as prejudicial press treatment deriving from injudicious government release of what I am pretty sure the ADA standards describe as prejudicial information in excess of the requirements of adequately informing the press...I think that in time objectives over & above getting "in" may become clear. In haste,